

## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 7 and 13 – 19 are in the application. Claims 6 and 7 are currently amended; claims 1, 2, 5, 13, 14, and 17 – 19 were previously presented; claims 8 – 12 and 20 – 34 have been canceled; and claims 3, 4, 15, and 16 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1 and 13 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the applicant as a result of the amendments herein.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 7 were objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 6 line 2, recites “...signals to be received from **the the** plurality of telephones”, and claim 7 lines 3-4, recites “...and rules associated with telephone call signals to be sent from **the the** plurality of telephones.” Appropriate correction was requested by the Office.

In reply thereto, the phrase “**the the**” including consecutive instances of the word “the” has been amended to recite instead the singular instance of the word “the” in claims 6 and 7.

Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 6 and 7 overcome the objection of record. Applicant therefore requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 6 and 7.

### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102

Claims 1 and 13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Slusky U.S. Patent No. 6,487,111. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant first notes that claim 1 relates to a system including a first telephone; a plurality of other telephones associated with the first telephone, the first telephone capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone and the plurality of other telephones associated with the first telephone; and a computing device coupled to the first telephone, the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules and to selectively route telephone call signals of the telephone call received by the first telephone to the first telephone and the plurality of other telephones based on user-specified rules. Applicant notes that claim 1 clearly states that the first telephone capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone and the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones.

Regarding the cited and relied upon Slusky, Applicant notes that Slusky does not appear to disclose the claimed aspect of the first telephone capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone, as alleged in the Office Action at page 4, paragraph (6). In particular, Slusky only discloses routing a single call in the disclosure (e.g., col. 5, lines 35 – 62). There is no disclosure of the telephone managing or being capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone.

Thus, the Office Action's characterization of Slusky is in direct contrast to the specific and explicit disclosure therein, as well as being counter to the claimed aspect of "the first telephone capable of managing separate telephone calls simultaneously conducted by the first telephone".

Applicant also notes that the cited and relied upon Slusky fails to disclose (or even suggest) the claimed aspect of "the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones". Applicant submits that

Slusky is directed to routing calls intended for a “called subscriber to be routed to each of a sequence of telephone numbers specified by the subscriber, even though a call placed to one of such telephone numbers is answered”. (See Slusky, Abstract) That is, Slusky’s method/system makes a determination that the call intended for the called subscriber has not been answered by the called subscriber and continues to route the call according to the subscriber’s preferences through a sequence of additional phone numbers in an effort to reach the intended subscriber. Thus, according to Slusky, calls are routed to specific phone numbers in a specific sequence as defined by the subscriber’s preferences. Slusky intends to call a subscriber by calling specific telephone numbers in a specific sequence and upon determining the subscriber has not answered to call, proceeds to work through the sequence of phone numbers. (See Slusky, col. 5, lines 35 – 62)

Applicant notes that Slusky explicitly discloses,

From time to time, the subscriber may want to be reached at any one of a sequence of different telephone numbers and, more particularly, at any one of those numbers even though a call placed to another one of those numbers that is earlier in the sequence is answered by someone other than the subscriber. That is, the subscriber is not present at the called location to take the call, but may be present at a location associated with one of the other telephone numbers. To this end and in accord with an aspect of the invention, a mechanism is provided for allowing a call to be routed to a telephone number in the sequence even if the call had been completed, or "answered," at a previous telephone number in the sequence. (emphasis added) (See Slusky, col. 5, lines 35 – 47)

According to Slusky, each of the calls in Slusky is intended for the called subscriber. Additionally, each placed call is made to a particular phone number as specified by the subscriber. That is, each of the phone calls in Slusky is made to the exact phone number for which it is intended. The initial call for intended for the called subscriber is made to the phone number it is intended for (e.g., home number) and subsequent calls are made to phone numbers according to the subscriber record (i.e., preference).

Thus, it is clear that Slusky fails to disclose the claimed aspect of “the computing device to determine a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones”. There is no disclosure in Slusky of a determination of “a telephone call received by the first telephone from a first one of the plurality of telephones” that “is intended for a second one of the plurality of other telephones”. Each of the calls in Slusky is made to the phone number for which the call is intended (and specified).

Applicant submits that it is clear that Slusky fails to disclose each and every aspect of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by Slusky. Applicant further submits that claim 13 is patentable over Slusky under 35 USC for at least the same reasons provided herein regarding claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant requests that reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 13 under 35 USC 102(b), and the allowance of same.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Slusky, in view of Brahm et al. U.S. Patent No. 7,103,167. This rejection is traversed.

Applicant submits that claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 depend from claims 1 and 13, respectively. Inasmuch as claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Slusky as demonstrated above, Applicant submits that the combination of Slusky and Brahm does not render claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 obvious. This is true since Brahm does not correct or otherwise compensate for the failures in disclosure of Slusky.

Accordingly, Applicant requests that reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 7 and 14 – 19 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a), and the allowance of same.

## C O N C L U S I O N

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (203) 972-5985.

Respectfully submitted,

November 19, 2008

Date

/Randolph P. Calhoune/

Randolph P. Calhoune  
Registration No. 45,371  
(203) 972-5985

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
**Customer Number: 28524**  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department  
Telephone: 732-321-3026